



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes and Opinions.

The Book of Enoch and the Son of Man.—In *The Expository Times* for August, Rev. R. H. Charles has another article on the term Son of Man, in which he restates and emphasizes points made in his preceding article. He replies to certain criticisms of his theory made by Mr. Bartlet in the June *Expository Times*. In the same number (August) Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D.D., writes a commendatory notice of Mr. Charles' new edition of the Book of Enoch.

T. H. R.

What is the Meaning of the Term, "The Kingdom of God?"—The July *Expository Times* asks: Can you state in a few words what you understand by the expression "The Kingdom of God" as used by our Lord? Answers to this question are given by four different scholars: Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Trinity College, Dublin; Rev. Professor James Orr, D.D., Edinburgh; Rev. Caleb Scott, D.D., Principal of the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester; and by Rev. Professor Alexander Stewart, D.D., Aberdeen.

Dr. Scott calls attention to the fact that whereas the term Kingdom of God was often on the lips of Christ he never once spoke of God as the King of the Kingdom. Dr. Scott writes: "Christ himself is the King of the Kingdom. It pertains to his mediatorial work. He founded it and laid down its laws. Absolute allegiance to him is the one condition of entrance."

The loftier thought of Christ, Dr. Scott goes on to say, is found in the word "Father." "All that the word 'King' suggests, which differentiates it from the word 'Father,' belongs to what is transitory. Nothing that the word 'Father,' rightly interpreted according to its inmost meaning, suggests can ever pass away. . . . Paul spoke of a time when the Mediator shall deliver up the Kingdom to the *Father*."

It may be questioned whether Dr. Scott's views as to who is the King of the Kingdom is just the true one. Dr. Stewart evidently takes it for granted that God is the King. "'The Kingdom of God,' as used by our Lord, signifies the whole sphere in which the will of God, as an ethical power, is recognized and obeyed. It was the reign of righteousness. . . . It has two sides—the intensive, the qualities which distinguish it (*cf.* Matt. 6:33; Luke 17:20, 21; John 3:3); and the extensive, the moral beings whom it includes, and so far as they are under its influence. . . . Perhaps what Jesus means by the 'Kingdom of God' is best seen from the position he gives it in the Lord's Prayer. God's Kingdom begins when his 'name is hallowed' with the turn-

ing of the heart in loyalty and devotion towards him; and is perfected when his 'will is done as in heaven so in earth.'"

Dr. Bernard writes: "The Hebrew theocracy had been a 'Kingdom of God' among men, and the expectation of the Kingdom of the Messiah to be established on earth was vivid and universal, as we see not only from passing phrases in the New Testament (*e.g.*, Acts 1:6,) but from the pseudepigraphical literature in which the hopes and fears of the later Jew appear. . . . The Kingdom of Christ on earth was to be the 'fulfilling' of the Jewish theocracy (Matt. 24:43) as in turn it pointed forward to its own consummation in heaven. . . . The equivalent expressions 'Kingdom of God,' 'Kingdom of heaven,' 'my Kingdom,' are always used of the church of Christ (a) on earth (Mark 4:30; Luke 9:27, etc.); or (b) in heaven (Mark 14:25; Luke 13:28, etc.)."

Dr. Orr, whose article is the longest and the fullest, gives perhaps the clearest and most satisfactory conception of what the Kingdom is, and the relation to it both of God and of Christ. "As a final though imperfect attempt at definition, . . . the Kingdom of God is that new, spiritual, invisible order of things introduced into the world by Christ, which is, on the one hand, the reign of God in his Fatherly love and grace in hearts trustfully submitted to him through his Son, and, on the other, the union of those thus saved and blessed for the doing of God's will and the realization of righteousness, which is but another name for the divine supremacy, in all the spheres and departments of their earthly existence, yet with the hope of a higher and fuller existence in eternity, where God shall be truly 'all in all.'" T. H. R.

Christ, the Revealer of Love. (1 John 3:13-18).—In *The Expository Times*, for June the series of valuable short studies by the Rev. Professor Richard Rothe in the first Epistle of John is continued. On the passages, "we know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren," and, "hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us," he comments as follows: "Brotherly love is the appropriate and certain living token of the new birth. John regards man's natural condition as a state of death. He does so for the express reason that it is a state void of love. Thus understood, this assertion of the gospel should be plain even to the man who is not inclined to believe the gospel. Even so-called natural reason must acknowledge that a state in which lack of love reigns cannot be called life, salvation and well-pleasing to God; we cannot deny that man's natural condition is such a state. It is self-evident to one who has an experimental knowledge of love, that wherever love is lacking life also is lacking, and that death reigns in its stead." "John now describes (ver. 16) what kind of brotherly love he means; what he will allow to pass for brotherly love. In the first place, the brotherly love which is active in behalf of one's brethren even to self-sacrifice; the love which we have learned to know in Christ. . . . In the self-sacrifice of Christ for us the full clear thought of love has dawned upon us. The idea of love in all its purity and greatness has

not grown up in the natural heart of man ; we owe it to the divine revelation in Christ. It is in truth the loftiest thought that has ever entered into the mind of man. It is in accordance with this standard that we have to measure our love, and not in accordance with the standard of human love, as we are in the habit of doing."

T. H. R.

The Unfinished Teaching of Christ.—This is the title of an article in the July *Expository Times*, by the Rev. Frederic Relton, A.K.C., Chelsea. Concerning the development of Christian doctrine he writes : "Some profess to find the whole Christian system in the sermon on the mount, and to discover incompatibility between the sermon on the mount and the Nicene creed, to say nothing of later doctrinal developments. . . . But to begin with, the sermon on the mount does not contain the whole of Christ's teaching even in outline. And, moreover, Christian theology and doctrine could not be developed until the earthly work of Christ was ended. It is, at least, remarkable that the profoundest theology of the New Testament is not the Pauline, but that of St. John, and is found in the last book of our New Testament—the Gospel of St. John—closely interwoven with the history, which St. John explains from time to time as the story is told. The Lord had indeed much to tell the apostles concerning Christian doctrine, but they could not then hear it or understand it. It was to be gradually taught to them (and to us) as their life and work demanded it, and as their capacity for understanding God's purposes grew and became stronger with exercise and knowledge and increased power."

T. H. R.

The Valley of Blessing.—In an article in *The Expository Times* for July, with the title, Incidents and Emblems, the editor, Rev. James Hastings, M.A., speaks of the peculiar genius which the Hebrew people so markedly possessed for giving appropriate names. He contrasts with them the moderns in this respect. Though perhaps our Anglo-Saxon ancestors had this gift to some extent, yet the English as a nation have lost it. He alludes to the difficulty which the Americans had in giving names in a new, vast country, and quotes the protest of Isaac Taylor in his *Words and Places* (pp. 313, 314): "In every State of the Union we find repeated again and again such unmeaning names as Thebes, Cairo, Memphis, Troy, Rome, Athens, Utica, Big Bethel, and the like. . . . The incongruity between the names and the appearance of some of these places is amusing. Thus Corinth 'consists of a wooden grog-shop and three log shanties; the Acropolis is represented by a grocery store. All that can be seen of the city of Troy is a timber house, three log huts, a saw mill, and twenty negroes.'" But we might say that though the genius of the English race is not that of inventing names, yet it is just that which is represented in this list of names quoted by Mr. Taylor. The names of a people reveal the ideals that are before them, and before the English race as they came to this vast unexplored continent were the high-

est ideals of the old world civilization; its culture and religion. Athens, Rome, Corinth, must be here, say the American pioneers. The actual places with their names often seem incongruous, but they bear witness to what the people as a nation are trying to work out. And it is the very same thing that the name quoted by Mr. Hastings gives witness to, viz.: the ideals of the Hebrew people. They named their places according to their ideals, so that as they came into the new land and developed in their national life, the names of the places are the reflex of their religious history and consciousness. As Mr. Hastings well says: "To every event in their history they gave a name; every locality where an event had taken place they marked by a name that was almost always surprisingly beautiful and appropriate. Well might the historian say, as he does say again and again, 'And it is called so and so unto this day.'"

"And on the fourth day they assembled themselves in the valley of Berachah, for there they blessed the Lord; therefore the name of that place was called The Valley of Berachah unto this day. (2 Chron. 20:26.) . . . The Valley of Blessing was so called not because they sought or found, but because they *gave* the blessing. . . . It is one of the blessed audacities of the Old Testament."

T. H. R.